

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed October 13, 2004, the Examiner objected to claim 10 as being duplicative of claim 9, rejected claims 1-4, 6, 15, 16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 4,621,885 ("Szczesny et al") and rejected claims 5, 7-14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Szczesny et al in view of United States Patent No. 5,588,864 ("Lin").

By this present amendment, claims 1 and 9 have been amended, and claims 19 and 20 are newly added. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-20 are currently pending in this application.

Claim 10 was objected as being duplicative of claim 9. Claim 9 has been amended to correct a minor typographical error. Accordingly, applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection directed to claim 10.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 15, 16 and 18 as being anticipated by Szczesny et al. A claim is anticipated if each and every element of the claim is shown in the anticipating reference. As Szczesny et al does not recite each and every element of amended independent claim 1, Szczesny et al does not anticipate claims 1-4, 6, 15, 16 and 18.

Amended independent claim 1 recites an electrical connector wherein, *inter alia*, said means for connecting the latch to the mating connector is located between a first end and a second end of the second leg. Because the means for connecting the latch to the mating connector (56) disclosed in Szczesny et al. is located at the end of the second leg, Szczesny et al does not anticipate independent claim 1. As claims 2-4, 6, 15, 16 and 18 are ultimately dependent on claim 1, claims 2-4, 6, 15, 16 and 18 are likewise not anticipated by Szczesny et al. As such, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 15, 16 and 18 as being anticipated by Szczesny et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 7-14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Szczesny et al in view of Lin. Claims 5, 7-14 and 17 all ultimately depend upon claim 1, which the applicant has argued is not anticipated by Szczesny et al for at least the reason stated above. Since Lin does not overcome the shortcomings stated above, the combination of Szczesny et al and Lin does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 5, 7-14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szczesny et al in

view of Lin.

Applicant is presenting claims 19 and 20 by this amendment. As claims 19 and 20 are not anticipated by Szczesny et al, or rendered obvious by the combination of Szczesny et al. in view of Lin, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner allow claims 19 and 20.

The Examiner also made the following prior art of record, but did not rely upon it: United States Patent No. 5,545,052 ("Hirai"), United States Patent No. 6,655,979 ("Lee"), United States Patent No. 6,582,252 ("Lin"), United States Patent No. 5,387,130 ("Fedder et al") and United States Patent No. 6,364,685 ("Manning"). Those references, whether taken alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest the subject matter claimed by the applicant.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections in view of the above remarks, and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conversation would facilitate the prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

MOLEX INCORPORATED

Date: 3-14-2005

By: 

Robert J. Zeitler

Registration No. 37,973

For BOB ZEITLER

Mailing Address:
MOLEX INCORPORATED
2222 Wellington Court
Lisle, Illinois 60532
Tel.: (630) 527-4884
Fax: (630) 416-4962